



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/526,264

01/20/2006

Alan Owen

207733 (8830-324)

7057

23973

7590

01/23/2007

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH  
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
ONE LOGAN SQUARE  
18TH AND CHERRY STREETS  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996

EXAMINER

LAGMAN, FREDERICK LYNDON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/526,264	OWEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frederick L. Lagman	3673	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** After-Final

(1) Frederick L. Lagman.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Larry Zelson.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 18 January 2007

**Time:** 2:00PM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*1, 4, 6, and 16*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: As broadly recited, it appears that at least claims 1 and 16 may read on a underwater type ROV or submarine. For example, the planes or flaps of submersible type vehicle would read on the "at least one member", such plane or flap rotates through a predetermined angle and may include stops. It would appear that these type vehicles may also include means for attaching equipment. To read over the ROV or submarine, it was suggested that in claims 1 and 16, the at least one member be further defined as being adapted to remove or anchor the underwater equipment to the seabed or riverbed. Also, it was suggested that claim 6 may be incorporated into claims 1 and 16. Mr. Zelson indicated that he would have to discuss the proposal with the applicant.